

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 27 2006

Application No. 10/665,532  
Amendment dated November 27, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of May 25, 2006

Docket No.: 1381-0302P

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. Claims 13 and 14 have been added.

The specification and claims 3, 5, 6, and 10 have been amended. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

It is noted that Species A of Figure 3 has been elected. However, independent claims 1 and 6 should be generic to all claims and should be allowable. As such, it is requested that the Election of Species Requirement now be withdrawn and all claims considered in this application.

Claims 1-6, 8-10, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In claim 1, the Examiner questions the meaning of the term "bite" and "has been lost". It is respectfully submitted that one skilled in the art would appreciate the meaning of these terms. They are not indefinite. As explained in the application, there is a coating such as 102 which is on the surface of the traction sheave. Over use or in emergency situations, such as a fire, this coating can be lost. In order to prevent an unsafe situation, various materials are provided whereby the engagement between the hoisting ropes and the traction sheave can be maintained. The engagement between the ropes and the sheave (or biting) should be clear. Basically, the rope is not slipping on the sheave. Other instances noted by the Examiner have been addressed by the foregoing amendments. It is respectfully submitted that the originally presented claims particularly pointed out and distinctly claim the subject matter of this invention. Nonetheless, clarification has been made. As such, the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection should now be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1-6 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bruns (U.S. Patent 3,279,762). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruns in view of Piech et al. (U.S. Patent 6,267,205). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The patent to Bruns discloses a noise abetting and traction improving elevator sheave. On the driving sheave 11, a plurality of channels 13 are provided. Within these channels are an insert 21 which is a pliable support element in the form of an elastomer strip (note column 3, line

Application No. 10/665,532  
Amendment dated November 27, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of May 25, 2006

Docket No.: 1381-0302P

18). As seen in Figure 3, alternate voids 33 form treads 35 in this insert 21. In Figure 4, a void 33 is seen in front of one of the treads 35. There are no different materials used in this insert.

Independent claim 1 recites an elevator with a hoisting rope set having hoisting ropes and at least one rope pulley being a traction sheave. The sheave is coated with a material increasing the coefficient of friction. The traction sheave forms together with the hoisting ropes a material pair that allows the hoisting rope to bite into the traction sheave after the coating on the surface of the traction sheave has been lost. When the coating or insert 21 of Bruns' is lost, traction can no longer be maintained. It can clearly be seen in Figure 4 that the ropes 31 are substantially smaller than the channels 13 on the heave 11. Thus, the rope would simply freely slip from the sheave.

Independent claim 6 sets forth a traction sheave with rope grooves and a coating. Under the coating on the outer rim of the traction sheave is a material that allows the hoisting rope to bite into the material. It is simply not completed that the insert 21 of Bruns would be removed or otherwise lost such that the sheave 11 would continue to operate. There is no material under insert 21 which would allow the hoisting rope to bite into it.

The dependent claims of the present application further distinguish this invention. For example, dependent claims 13 and 14 bring out that the coating and the other materials are made of different materials. Dependent claim 10 recites an insert implanted under the coating. Such an insert is simply not found in the Bruns patent.

The secondary reference to Piech et al. does not overcome the noted deficiencies of the Bruns patent. The elevator and the traction sheave as recited in independent claims 1 and 6 as well as the dependent claims are not found in the prior art utilized by the Examiner. As such, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 103 rejections should now be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Favorable reconsideration and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Because the prior art cited by the Examiner has been included merely to show the state of prior art and is not being utilized to reject the claims, no further comments concerning this patent are considered necessary at this time.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 27 2006

Docket No.: 1381-0302P

Application No. 10/665,532  
Amendment dated November 27, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of May 25, 2006

number listed below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants respectfully petition for a three (3) month extension of time for filing a reply in connection with the present application, and the required fee of \$1020.00 is attached hereto.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: November 27, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

  
By Joe McKinney Muncy  
Joe McKinney Muncy  
Registration No. 32,334  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant